

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Of pending claims 1-20, claims 1-12 were allowed and claims 13-20 were rejected. Applicants appreciate allowance of claims 1-12. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested per the remarks below.

Claim 13 was rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 20 of U.S. Patent No. 6,524,101 in view of Breads et al. 4,856,991. **And, claim 19 was rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting** as being unpatentable over claim 34 of U.S. Patent No. 6,524,101 in view of Breads et al. 4,856,991.

To expedite prosecution, Applicant herewith submits a Terminal Disclaimer to overcome these rejections. The Terminal Disclaimer disclaims the term which would extend beyond the expiration date of the full statutory term defined in 35 U.S.C. 154 to 156 and 173 of that set forth by U.S. Patent No. 6,524,101.

Claims 13-18 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-5 of U.S. Patent No. 5,975,893 in view of Breads et al. 4,856,991.

To expedite prosecution, the Terminal Disclaimer also disclaims the term which would extend beyond the expiration date of the full statutory term defined in 35 U.S.C. 154 to 156 and 173 of that set forth by U.S. Patent No. 4,856,991.

Claim 19 was rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 9 of U.S. Patent No. 6,309,215. **And, claim 20 rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting** as being unpatentable over claim 5 of U.S. Patent No. 6,309,215.

To expedite prosecution, the Terminal Disclaimer also disclaims the term which would extend beyond the expiration date of the full statutory term defined in 35 U.S.C. 154 to 156 and 173 of that set forth by U.S. Patent No. 6,309,215.

The drawings were objected to because they do not include the reference sign 110 (page 12, line 26). Applicants apologize for the typographical error in the paragraph

Appl. No. 10/040,269
Amdt. dated November 3, 2003
Reply to Office Action of October 6, 2003

PATENT

starting on page 12, line 22. The reference sign for attachment device 110 (page 12, line 26) should read attachment device 100, as shown in the Amendments to the Specification section of this document. With this amendment to the specification, Applicants believe the drawings are now in condition for allowance.

In addition, regarding the information disclosure statement filed April 16, 2002, an additional copy of the filed information disclosure statement and references will be resent with this Amendment to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2).

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,


Lynn M. Thompson
Reg. No. 47,991

Attachment: *Information Disclosure Statement*
filed 4/8/02

Terminal Disclaimer

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400
Fax: 415-576-0300
Attachments
LMT:lm
60061028 v1